DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 374 EA 027 562

AUTHOR Cohen, Carolyn
TITLE The Use of Idea-Based Policy Instruments in Promoting School-Linked Service Integration.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 95
CONTRACT RP91002001
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; *Community Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Family Programs; *Human Services; *Information Dissemination; *Integrated Services; Local Issues; Partnerships in Education; *Policy Formation; Program Implementation; Public Policy; Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the potential of a specific public policy tool to further principles of programs devoted exclusively to the Integration of Education and Human Services (IEHS). Section 1 describes the nature of the problem in establishing the need for IEHS. Section 2 describes policy tools currently used to implement IEHS, introducing the concept of "idea-based instruments," or "idea tools" as described by Janet Weiss (1990). It identifies existing IEHS policy tools that can be considered idea-based instruments and argues that these instruments must be part of any policy tool kit used to implement IEHS. The third section explores how local policymakers operationalize idea tools at the community level. It presents findings from interviews conducted with professionals active in implementing IEHS practices. Conclusions and directions for further research are offered in section 4. The study found that: (1) idea tools may be critical in translating IEHS policies into systemic reform; (2) ideas travel laterally and vertically; (3) professionals in the Northwest United States are using a wide variety of idea tools--convening stakeholders, sponsoring conferences, and designing marketing plans; and (4) idea tools may work best in conjunction with other policy tools. Appendices contain names of the 7 focus group participants and 14 interviewees, the interview questions, and examples of IEHS models. (Contains 27 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 395 374

THE Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

PROGRAM REPORT

THE USE OF IDEA-BASED POLICY INSTRUMENTS IN PROMOTING SCHOOL-LINKED SERVICE INTEGRATION

Carolyn Cohen

January 30, 1995

Child, Family, and Community Program
Helen Nissani, Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

EA 027 662

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly, or in part, by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Department of Education, under Contract Number RP91002001. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the view of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE USE OF IDEA-BASED POLICY INSTRUMENTS IN PROMOTING SCHOOL-LINKED SERVICE INTEGRATION

Carolyn Cohen

January 30, 1995

Child, Family, and Community Program
Helen Nissani, Director

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ii

Executive Summary iii

Background 1

Introduction 3

Section One: Nature of the Problem 4

- Policy Issues 5
- IEHS Principles Defined 5
- Policy Role in Community and Professional Development 6

Section Two: Policy Tools -- The Case for Idea-Based Policy Instruments 8

Section Three: Idea-Based Instruments -- Local Strategies 11

- Implementing Idea Tools at the Community Level 11
- Target Audiences in Local Communities 11
- Strategies to Reach Community Members 12
- Communicating Ideas to State Level Policymakers 16
- What Locals Want State Policymakers to Hear 17
- Strategies to Inform State Level Policymakers 18

Section Four: Conclusions 19

Next Steps 21

References 23

Appendix 1: Interviewees 26

Appendix 2: Interview Questions 28

Appendix 3: Examples of IEHS Models 29

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the following people for their assistance, review, and suggestions: Helen Nissani, Director, Child, Family and Community Program, NWREL; Mike Knapp, Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, University of Washington; Susan Mosborg, educational consultant; Professor Robert Plotnick, acting dean, Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Washington.

I wish to especially thank those who participated in interviews and provided written materials for this report:

Theresa Bommersbach, Project Coordinator, Readiness To Learn Program, Yakima Valley Farmworkers Clinic, Toppenish, Washington.

Rick Brandon, Executive Director, Human Services Policy Center, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Sarah France, Director, Washington Alliance for Restructuring Education, Seattle, Washington.

Mary Frost, Unit Manager, Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program, Department of Trade and Community Development, Olympia, Washington.

'lyn Horine, Oregon Family Resource Coalition, Salem, Oregon.

Mike Knapp, Project Evaluator, TIC program, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Sue Lerner, Director, Educational Support and Human Services, South Central School District, Tukwila, Washington.

Steve Mullin, Executive Director, Partnership for Learning, Seattle, Washington.

Steve Nelson, Director, Rural Education Program, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon.

Ann Reed, Community Coordinator, Families in Partnership, Libby, Montana.

Barbara Riley, School Liaison, Family Housing Intervention Network, Women's Opportunity and Resource Development, Missoula, Montana.

Ken Settlemeier, Director, K–12 Education, Lincoln County School District, Newport, Oregon.

Billie Warford, Director, Early Childhood Project, MT. State University, Bozeman, Montana.

Sara D. Watson, Senior Associate, Center for the Study of Social Policy, Washington, DC.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Policymakers have become increasingly concerned with the fragile state of American families -- and with good cause. Risk factors such as poverty, teen pregnancy, and violence increasingly affect children. The Child, Family, and Community Program (CFC) of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory assists leaders in education, government, business, and human services by addressing improved services to children and their families. One aspect of improved services is a systemic reform that allows education and human services to work together more effectively on behalf of children and their families. We refer to this reform as the "integration of education and human services" (IEHS). This paper describes the potential of an alternative public policy instrument to further IEHS. We consider this paper a "think piece" meant to encourage questioning and exploration regarding the role of public policies in effecting the IEHS reforms.

The IEHS concept has increasing support from local, state, and federal policymakers and professionals in education and human service agencies. Other terms are sometimes used for this concept, including "school-linked service integration. IEHS means that the various service delivery systems will be redesigned to support children and their families. As Mosborg, Nissani, and Hagans (1994) note, "At its core, this involves developing shared principles and goals across systems and community-based planning for more collaborative, comprehensive, and effective services . . ."

A policy "tool" or "instrument" is the strategy used to meet a policy goal. Examples include regulations, sanctions, and inducements for complying with certain policies. In this paper, we examine how the sharing of ideas can be used to further policy goals. Drawing on an article by Janet Weiss (1990), we refer to the use of ideas interchangeably as "idea-based instruments" and "idea tools." One type of idea tool is a public information campaign. As examples, we think of a media blitz which encouraged us to wear safety restraints while driving or admonished abstinence from drinking and driving. Other examples include convening activities, the effective use of stories, establishing communication networks, and providing training programs.

In this paper, we reached the following five findings:

1. Idea tools may be critical in translating IEHS policies into systemic reform. The effective implementation of IEHS is grounded in consensus among stakeholders regarding how to best support and strengthen families in their community. These stakeholders include parents, agency directors, and school personnel. Idea tools can be used to provide stakeholders with sufficient information on the nature of the problems and demonstrate how integrations can alleviate or solve these problems and foster public and professional discourse.

2. Ideas travel laterally and "up" as well as "down". While the concept of idea tools is often thought of as a top-down approach, we found that IEHS ideas are originated and effectively used to build collaborations at the local level. They also originate at the

local level and are used to inform state level officials. This point is particularly significant as IEHS collaborations are grounded in the concept of local-level decisionmaking.

3. Northwest communities are clearly utilizing a wide variety of idea tools to promote IEHS principles and values. As part of our exploration into the use of idea tools to strengthen IEHS, we interviewed Northwest professionals active in implementing IEHS practices. Although these professionals had not necessarily considered ideas as a policy tool, they used them in a variety of ways. These strategies, detailed in Section Four of the report, include convening stakeholders, sponsoring conferences and trainings, and designing marketing plans.

4. Idea tools may work best in conjunction with other policy tools. In many cases, ideas alone are not enough to effect change. In the Northwest, IEHS ideas are often used in conjunction with inducements such as providing funding or demonstration projects or technical assistance.

5. Although many idea strategies are in use, further work is needed to assess their effectiveness. Several ideas for future exploration are presented in a "Next Steps" section.

This paper is intended for an audience of policymakers, especially those already engaged in inter-agency collaborations, such as directors and key stakeholders of local, state-level, and regionwide collaborations. We hope it will prove as useful to leaders already engaged in this field as it was to one of our reviewers who wrote: "As a practitioner in the field (especially in the 'rural' field), papers like this give me the same 'fix' I get when I attend a conference and head the various discussions by speakers and panelists about a subject. Although I can't interact like I can at a conference, the paper allows me to formulate ideas and actions that I can then discuss with my colleagues." We believe it will also be of general interest to policymakers and analysts, including state legislators and their staffs.

BACKGROUND

Gena: One Mother's Story: Gena is trying to develop job skills while contending with an unemployed, abusive husband. To sign up for food stamps at the welfare office, domestic abuse counseling at the women's center, and literacy education at the community college, she will have to go to three different offices in three different parts of town. She has no one with whom to leave her children. Ricky, the oldest, is in kindergarten in the morning, but Gena -- knowing that she will not be back in time to pick him up -- takes him, as well as the younger children, with her. Because the bus line does not come through her neighborhood, she will have to take a cab, unless she can find someone able to drive and wait for her. She must bring special documents to prove her eligibility at the food stamp office, and then make two more trips before learning whether she will be certified. Attending weekly domestic abuse counseling and literacy classes, if the class times do not conflict with one another, will multiply transportation and child-care costs and challenges. Eventually, the costs will outweigh the benefits and it is likely that Gena will drop the programs before her problems are resolved. Meanwhile, Ricky's teacher has asked Gena to come to the school for a conference. She told Gena that Ricky may not be ready to be promoted to first grade next year and blames his lack of progress on poor attendance (Melaville, Blank & Asayesh, 1993, p.10).

Policymakers have become increasingly concerned with the fragile state of American families. Current statistics show that 40 percent of Americans living below the poverty level are under the age of 18 (Hodgkinson, 1989), one in four children under the age of six lives in poverty, one child in four is at risk of failing in school, and the number of children facing other risk factors such as teen pregnancy or violence is rising steadily (Melaville, Blank, & Asayesh, 1993). In addition, many families without identified risk factors experience crises -- financial, medical, or personal emergencies -- which affect the well-being of their members.

These concerns are being addressed by the Child, Family, and Community Program (CFC) of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL). CFC works to assist education, government, business, and human services leaders in addressing the provision of improved services to children and their families. The CFC program is engaged in a research and development project to study these issues. The Integration of Education and Human Services (IEHS) project brings together the knowledge bases of relevant fields of research with assessment of community-based models for school/community partnerships in support of comprehensive services to students.

As part of this mission, CFC has recently produced three papers which report on current policies in the NWREL region: Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. These papers draw on knowledge NWREL has gained from providing technical assistance to state policymakers and local-level practitioners. Each of the three papers incorporates indepth interviews and lessons from the field into a context of theoretical policy issues. The first paper, *Northwest Policy: Bridges and Barriers to the Integration of Education and Human*

Services, addresses policy issues confronting Northwest innovators of integration of education and human services efforts. The second paper (developed in collaboration with Planning and Service Coordination), *Integrating Education and Human Services: Lessons from Early Initiatives in the Northwest*, depicts the history and implementation of new state policies in Oregon and Washington. The following paper is an exploratory investigation into the use of a public policy tool -- the idea-based instrument -- in implementing IEHS policies and practices.

INTRODUCTION

The systems serving children and their families fall into three basic categories: health, education, and social services. Health services provide both mental and physical care, education services provide academic and vocational instruction, and social services provide assistance in diverse areas such as training, housing, day care, and counseling (Morrill, 1992). Within each of the three categories, multiple agencies operate at the community level. An agency's funding and mission are often based on its unique characteristics -- its own mandate, target audience, funding stream, and delivery system (Morrill). However, for families needing services, the distinction between these three systems and among their multiple agencies is artificial -- their own needs are complex and intertwined. For example, a child who is malnourished and depressed will not do well in school, regardless of what educational innovations are taking place at that site. That child and his/her family will, however, benefit from access to a comprehensive array of health, education, and social services.

This dissonance between a family's need for comprehensive services and the structure and philosophies of the agencies meant to serve families is being addressed by public policies which promote "service integration." "Service integration is a strategy to remove administrative and programmatic barriers that inhibit service and design a system in which the comprehensive needs of a family can be holistically addressed" (Gerry and Certo, 1992, p. 120). While the term "service integration" is used for many models, including those which exclude education, this paper will refer exclusively to the integration of education and human services (IEHS). Another term commonly used for this policy is "school-linked service integration." School-linked service integration comes in a wide variety of models. Examples of Northwest IEHS models can be found in the appendix.

This paper analyzes the potential of a specific public policy tool to further IEHS principles and practices. Section One describes the nature of the problem (i.e., establishing the need for IEHS, followed by a description of IEHS principles of successful integration of education and human services efforts). Section Two describes policy tools currently used to implement IEHS, introducing the concept of "idea-based instruments" or "idea tools" as described by Janet Weiss (1990). It identifies existing IEHS policy tools which can be considered idea-based instruments, and argues that these instruments must be part of any policy tool kit used to implement IEHS. Section Three explores how local level policymakers operationalize idea tools at the community level. It reports on findings from interviews conducted with professionals active in implementing IEHS practices. Section Four provides conclusions and direction for further research.

SECTION ONE: NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

The state of California . . . maintains 169 child- and youth-serving agencies overseen by 37 different state entities located in seven different state departments. (Koppich and Kirst, 1993, p.124)

Policy Issues

IEHS policies address philosophical and systemic issues relating to the provision of human services. The philosophical issues center around the role of public policy and practice in supporting families, particularly those who are bearing the brunt of demographic, economic, and social changes. As a result, the policy discussion considers perceptions and beliefs about the role of human services systems and the use of community resources in strengthening families. In addition, IEHS policies critique the current service delivery system, in particular those structural barriers which impede provision of comprehensive and collaborative services. For the most part, the systemic barriers are seen as the result of a prior view of human service delivery which is not working well for families today. This section outlines these philosophical concerns and how they are manifested in current systems and practices; defines principles of successful "service integration"; and provides a rationale for school-linked service integration policies.

IEHS policies embody certain philosophies regarding values and beliefs about both community and individual responsibilities. They perceive a two-way connection between families and communities. In other words, IEHS principles are based on beliefs that the role and responsibility of families are to assure the well-being of their own members (Jewett, Conklin, Hagans & Crohn, 1991), and at the same time that all members of a community have a responsibility for, and a vested interest in, ensuring the well-being of children and families. IEHS policies distinguish themselves from existing human service delivery models which are focused on client weaknesses rather than strengths (deficit-based model); crisis- or remediation-oriented; provider-driven; and offer services in a fragmented and categorical fashion. In contrast, the terms commonly associated with IEHS policies are ecological, holistic, empowering, consumer-driven, family-centered, honors diversity, and community-based. However, it is important to note that a wide spectrum of integration models exist, many of which do not incorporate all of these values. For example, a program might offer services in an integrated manner, but still be crisis- rather than prevention-driven.

In addition to a shift in ideological orientation, IEHS policies focus on systemic barriers to comprehensive and collaborative service. The systemic barriers which prevent human services from being offered in a comprehensive and collaborative manner derive from the structures and mandates of the three types of agencies -- education, health, and social services -- as well as the long-term trend toward increasing professionalization and specialization (Morrill, 1992). "Successfully linking social and health services to the schools will be a slow and difficult process for many reasons. The education, health, and social services systems are massive and have been built up over decades, and each has a unique history and funding

structure. They are guided by their own groups of professionals, specially trained and unaccustomed to sharing either responsibility or authority with other disciplines and professions" (Behrman, 1992, p.9). Several authors (Morrill, 1992; Behrman, 1992; Koppich & Kirst, 1993) provide examples of systemic barriers which have occurred as a result, such as categorical funding, different eligibility standards that prevent the provision of comprehensive services, and agency restrictions on information sharing.

As Behrman (1992) points out above, the current service delivery structure mitigates against inter-professional collaboration. The lack of inter-professional training and an emphasis on specialized instruction may result in providers who understand principally their own approach to problem analysis and service delivery. Specialization is also manifested in professionals' perceptions of what types of work they should or would do, and rules on what types of activities can take place in certain facilities such as schools. A related problem is that children/families are not seen in the context of their environments. For example, one professional might be working with a child who is "acting out" in school, without communicating with a colleague in another agency who is treating the parents' substance abuse problems which contributes toward the child's behavior. This specialized approach is in contrast to an ecological and holistic approach which recognizes the influences of immediate and extended family, family circumstance, family values, and community (Adler & Gardner, 1993).

Another outcome of these systemic barriers is limited family access to existing human services. "Only a modest imagination is needed to grasp an illustrative situation of two children with school attendance and performance problems who are nutritionally deficient, medically under-served, and depressed in a single-parent family in which the mother works two jobs in a neighborhood beset with drug problems" (Morrill, 1992, p.38). The burden on such a family to access and follow up with needed multiple services -- educational, health, and social -- all located at numerous sites around their city, is easy to understand. However, bureaucratic barriers are not the only factor impeding access to services. Many families do not access services which are unsupportive or which are, for example, culturally inappropriate or focused on family deficits rather than strengths (Melaville, et al. 1993).

IEHS Principles Defined

The IEHS policy response to these philosophical and systemic concerns encompasses an ecological and holistic approach. Policy solutions are often grounded in a set of IEHS principles which are meant to guide policies and practice. Recent policy papers (Nissani & Hagans, 1992; Melaville et al., 1993; Adler & Gardner, 1993) identify IEHS principles. While none of the reports use precisely the same terminology, their basic ideas are similar. This report uses the following six *Key Elements of Successful Integration* (Nissani & Hagans) developed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL).

1. **Family-Centered Service Delivery.** The family unit, rather than just the child, is the focus of support. Services address the child's needs in the context of its family. Service providers are sensitive to the culture and perspectives of the family.

2. **Comprehensive Service Focus.** Services meet more than one identified family need. Agencies engage in joint goal setting and share information.

3. **Prevention Orientation.** Programs strive to strengthen the family unit. Rather than deal only with crises, the service system offers interventions which proactively subvert reaching a crisis state.

4. **Empowerment Focus.** Families are provided with choices of services and given responsibility for serving as partners, rather than just recipients, of services. This term also refers to community empowerment as local communities are given decision-making power about the use of resources and system design.

5. **Local Community Focus.** Local communities determine how integrations are developed. Communities are partners with the state in assessing their needs and designing appropriate integration efforts.

6. **Synergistic Procedures and Process.** Providers and policymakers make a conscious effort to eliminate bureaucratic barriers which hinder integration. In addition, policy and practice positively address strategies for leveraging resources through means such as innovative partnerships. These partnerships may include public, nonprofit, and private members.

Policy Role in Community and Professional Development

IEHS proponents believe that incorporating family support principles into practice will strengthen families, resulting in better outcomes for "fragile families," as well as for any family needing support from the human service systems. Indeed, many argue that these principles apply to any service geared to families, whether considered fragile or not: programs offered by the local parks department or library can embody these principles in services provided to all of their constituents. Some conclude that implementing these policies directly addresses many social, educational, and health problems which threaten our collective economic and social future. For example, Gardner (1992) asserts that education reform goals cannot be accomplished until children's non-instructional needs are met; meeting these needs can determine whether a child is ready or able to learn. School-linked service integration polices are often incorporated in education reform goals, including current school restructuring endeavors, that aim to improve academic outcomes for children whose social problems interfere with academic participation and achievement (Jehl & Kirst, 1992; Gardener, 1992).

Although the rationale for IEHS may be apparent to many, and both public monies and private foundation funds have been used to implement numerous demonstration models, there is clear evidence that the concept has not received communitywide "buy-in." A recent survey (Slaughter, 1993) asked Washington residents to identify policy efforts that would improve educational outcomes: "Increased availability of social services" ranked last among 10 items. The successful implementation of IEHS policies is grounded in stakeholders' knowledge-base, values, and preferences. The stakeholders must become informed about the nature of the problem, and come to believe that they have a common interest in addressing it. There are many stakeholders in this collaborative endeavor: human services providers, local governments, parents, potential consumers of services, employers, and community members. Buy-in issues depend on the target audience. For human service professionals, turf issues and

other professional concerns may prevent buy-in. Other community members may simply be unfamiliar with the concept because it hasn't been well explained or modeled for them.

How is public policy used to appropriately develop the community and professional knowledge-base and to present information on the value of IEHS practices? Three challenging tasks face policymakers who are concerned with fostering both community and provider development:

1. The first is to inform stakeholders so they understand the nature of the problem. Many community members are unfamiliar with the extent of social, educational, and health problems that a significant number of children and their families face. Even those who are aware of these problems may be uninformed about the weaknesses in the current human service delivery system.
2. The second challenge policymakers face is in describing how the implementation of IEHS principles and practices can address these problems by supporting families and strengthening communities.
3. Third, policymakers must address the need to foster public and inter-professional dialogue which develops shared values relating to family support policies, including the role of community and family responsibility.

While individual collaborations have great flexibility in determining how to best serve their community members (one of the core principles), the very nature of IEHS, which is grounded in values and beliefs about family support, requires a certain level of shared values. Sharon Lynn Kagan, senior associate at the Yale Bush Child Development Center, addressed this concern in a recent keynote to the *Investing in Children, Families, and Communities* conference (December, 1994) sponsored by NWREL's Child, Family, and Community Program. Kagan noted that the ideas and spirit of family support must become institutionalized and embedded into the social network of our country. She suggests that this will happen when we meet several conditions, including agreement on what we mean by family support (i.e., IEHS principles), and creation of a public mandate to make family support systems available. Kagan cited former surgeon general Julius Richmond in identifying three necessary components of a social revolution: an informed knowledge-base, a social strategy, and public will. Kagan feels that the public will to support all families is not part of our current value system. Other analysts address the importance of gaining a consensus on values. Adler & Gardner (1993) point out that other countries are ahead of us in establishing an ethos (i.e., a "value position" for IEHS reforms).

The next section argues that policymakers concerned with addressing the three challenges posed above -- providing the information necessary to an understanding of the nature of the problem, describing how IEHS policies and practices can strengthen families and communities, and fostering public and inter-professional discourse on family support issues -- may be able to make headway through the use of idea-based policy instruments.

SECTION TWO: POLICY TOOLS -- THE CASE FOR IDEA-BASED POLICY INSTRUMENTS

Ideas can mobilize energy, bestow competence, introduce alternatives, direct attention, even change minds about ultimate goals and preferences. In short, ideas can be effective policy instruments. (Weiss, 1990, p.193).

Schneider and Ingram (1990) note that the goal of public policy is to encourage or enable people to do something they would not otherwise do. Policy enables government and citizens to address problems including those where (1) the nature of the problem is unclear or (2) people "need to be convinced that a policy-preferred alternative fits into their value scheme" (p. 520). A policy tool is a strategy used to meet a policy goal (Saloman and Lund, 1989). In other words, policy tools are the means by which policy goals are translated into action (Elmore, 1987). An effective policy tool must be based on an understanding of what is causing the problem, as well as the policy goals. In some cases, the choice of tools can be more controversial that the policy itself (Hood, 1983). Policymakers take these factors into consideration when selecting from a wide array of tools, including regulations, sanctions, direct and indirect spending, inducements (such as grants which reward institutions for changed behavior), and public information campaigns.

Policymakers frequently find it most effective to utilize a combination of the tools in their tool kit. For example, federal and state policymakers currently use a variety of tools to encourage and implement IEHS policies including: establishing requirements such as proof of inter-agency collaboration as a condition of receiving state funding; enacting sanctions, such as taking away funding for not collaborating; and providing inducements such as grants, technical assistance, evaluation, and other resources to promote integration efforts. Many of these strategies focus on state and local level innovations and intend to produce process outcomes such as development of common goal/policy statements, shared governance structures, collegiality among professions, systems for automatic electronic data sharing, or systems to jointly conduct needs assessments (Jehl & Kirst, 1992).

While a combination of policy tools may be the most effective means of implementing IEHS, one type of tool -- idea-based instruments -- may be particularly helpful in effecting the values-based and long-lasting systemic reform which defines IEHS. "If ideas succeed in changing people's skills, options, priorities, and preferences about policy outcomes, their impact may be more enduring than is usual with other policy instruments . . ." (Weiss, 1990, p.195).

What is an idea-based instrument? Weiss (1990) argues that while "ideas" are generally considered a precursor to policymaking and a guide to selection of appropriate policy tools, they can also be considered "generic" policy instruments themselves.

By "ideas," I mean propositions about the relationships between policy variables and social phenomena: They may explain or describe what is, what

> *could be, or what should be. They work as policy instruments by inviting people to think differently about their situations by providing them with information about new alternatives . . . or leading people to accept different values or preferences* (p.179).

Weiss' article describes how the ideas approach is distinguished from other policy strategies: "They teach, persuade, focus, argue, scold, coax, inform, and model desirable behavior. Ideas reach people in a variety of ways, appropriate to the complexity and diversity of the people and institutions whose behavior is at stake. But they reach people through their minds, not through their pocketbooks or their fear of coercion" (p.194). One illustration of an idea tool is a public information campaign. Examples include media campaigns that exhort people to use seat belts, refrain from drinking while pregnant, or abstain from illegal drugs. Other types of idea tools include training sessions, targeted dissemination of research and evaluation, curriculum development, conferences, workshops, and technical assistance (Weiss).

Why are idea tools critical to the implementation of IEHS policies? Many policy analysts conclude that effective, lasting implementation of IEHS relies on the stakeholders adopting its underlying values and principles. Dougherty (1994) writes that a "revolution" in state and local policymaker and practitioner beliefs about service provision is needed. Melaville et. al. (1993) speaks of: "*a revision of the ways that people and institutions think*, behave, and use their resources to affect fundamentally the types, quality, and degree of service delivery to children and families." Section One pointed out that policymakers face significant challenges in informing stakeholders of the nature of the problem and encouraging them to value IEHS principles. Idea tools can be useful strategies for attaining these goals. As an example, the annual *State of Washington's Children Report*, which depicts the condition of families and children and is targeted to decisionmakers, as well as the general public, is an idea tool which helps stakeholders understand the nature of the problem. Furthermore, idea-based instruments are effective when policies aim to persuade stake-holders to adopt certain values. Weiss points out that while inducements assume that an incentive is needed to change behavior, idea tools assume that behavior or practice can be changed by persuading people to "value different ends" (p. 179). An idea tool might inspire a sense of mission or change people's minds about their preferences or goals. In the case of IEHS, if the key players do not really value core principles, it is likely that the changes brought about by mandates and/or inducements will not be long lasting. "When inducements cease, so do the effects. But when ideas are the primary instruments, the effects may linger" (Weiss, p.195).

Furthermore, idea tools may be especially useful in targeting professional audiences. As noted earlier in the report, a key group of stakeholders-- human service providers -- is characterized by professional specialization. "Ideas may be especially important policy tools in domains . . . that are dominated by professionals. Professionals are, by definition, carriers or agents of formal knowledge" (Weiss, 1990, citing Freidson, 1986). Since human service professionals make many independent decisions and are influenced by their professional culture and personal values, informing and influencing their ideas, values, and commitments becomes especially important.

Although idea tools are an effective component of many policy tool kits, they are not usually used independently. For example, a public information campaign is an idea tool that promotes safe driving -- encouraging people to buckle up and refrain from drinking and driving -- but it is used most effectively in concert with other tools, such as requirements to use seat belts and sanctions for drunk driving. Weiss (1990) notes that idea tools are frequently used in concert with inducements and that the combination of the two often produces a synergistic effect. In fact, inducement tools are often used to encourage and reward IEHS efforts. States, the federal government, and many large foundations offer inducements such as grants, demonstration project funds, and technical assistance to persuade communities to implement integration models.

While this paper focuses on local-level strategies, it is important to keep in mind that the federal and state governments play a critical role in IEHS idea campaigns. Federal policy statements and laws such as Goals 2000, the Family Preservation Act, the ESEA, and the Head Start re-authorization incorporate IEHS language and principles. State offices such as the Superintendent of Public Instruction are often used as effective bully pulpits to "share the vision." State policy and funding decisions enable and encourage local action. The state of Washington, for example, has actually codified IEHS principles into state law. In 1992, the Washington legislature passed SB 6428, the Family Policy Initiative, which requires that five state agencies (Public Instruction; Social and Health Services; the Secretary of Health; Employment Security; and Community Development) ensure that their new programs comply with IEHS principles which they define as family-oriented, culturally relevant , coordinated, locally planned, community-based, prevention-focused, outcome-based, customer friendly, and creative at the front line level.

How can idea tools be operationalized at the local level to promote IEHS? Section One identified three "idea-related" challenges facing policymakers: providing information on the nature of the problem, describing the benefits of IEHS policies, and fostering public and professional discourse. How do local policymakers apply idea tools to these tasks? Idea tools have primarily been employed as a "top-down" approach (Weiss, 1990). However, three factors make the consideration of IEHS implementation and the use of idea tools especially interesting to local policymakers at this time: (1) there is a growing trend toward higher levels of government ceding authority in several policy areas to local communities; (2) IEHS principles in particular demand widespread community participation in decisionmaking; and (3) as Morrill (1992) points out, many human services programs serving youth and families (notably education), are decentralized, and already make policy decisions at the local level. Because of these three factors, the challenge to local level policymakers is how to use "lateral" and "bottom-up" rather than "top down" strategies to reach fellow community members and professional colleagues. The next section illustrates the use of these tools in implementing IEHS practices.

SECTION THREE: IDEA-BASED INSTRUMENTS -- LOCAL STRATEGIES

Our biggest downfall is concentrating more on building our program, but not reaching the community at large. In fact, many social service providers still don't know about it. (School Liaison, IEHS demonstration program)

This section addresses the question, "How is the concept of idea tools operationalized in promoting IEHS?" Specifically, it explores how idea-based instruments are used by local level practitioners, such as agency directors and superintendents, to address the three idea-based policy challenges posed in Section One: providing the information necessary to an understanding of the nature of the problem, describing how IEHS policies and practices can strengthen families and communities, and fostering public and inter-professional discourse on family support issues. Findings show that Northwest local level policymakers do use idea tools which address one or more of these challenges. Two avenues of inquiry were explored: (1) how do local level practitioners promote IEHS with others in their community (a lateral approach), and (2) how do local practitioners promote IEHS to policymakers in state government (a bottom-up approach). In order to answer these questions, telephone interviews were conducted with educators and social service providers responsible for implementing IEHS models in their local communities. Additional area experts were also interviewed.*

Interviewees were asked to describe:

- Target audiences in their communities who need to be reached
- Idea tool strategies used to reach those local community members
- Ideas and information that they perceive are needed by state-level policymakers
- Local community strategies to inform state-level officials

IMPLEMENTING IDEA TOOLS AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL

Target Audiences in Local Communities

Interviewees responsible for implementing IEHS principles and practices in their communities were asked, "Which categories of community members do you believe we need to reach?" They identified several audiences who fell into two basic categories: fellow human service providers, and other community members. Examples of service providers who need to be reached included a full range of education, social, and other human service professionals

---

* A list of interviewees and the interview questions can be found in Appendix 1.

Examples of community members included the business community, parents, and city government officials. One interviewee pointed out that each IEHS model is unique, and as a result, involvement of different groups varied from community to community.

Strategies to Reach Community Members

After identifying which audiences needed to be reached, interviewees were asked, "What strategies have you used in promoting IEHS practices?" This question was open-ended and their examples were grouped into the seven general categories listed below. The responses demonstrated how idea tools are effectively operationalized to promote IEHS principles.

1. **Convening Activities.** IEHS facilitators convened key stakeholders to facilitate both community and professional development. Service providers and educators used the opportunity for planning, networking, and sharing professional concerns (professional development). Community members were encouraged to discuss community needs and establish goals or vision statements (community development).

    - A school administrator described how she developed a school- social service provider network: "We have an informal group that meets once a month at one of the middle schools. I just started having an open meeting with no agenda. The meeting lasts 90 minutes and participants say what they are doing, what they want to do with certain families, what types of providers they would like to link up with. The providers find it so useful that they stay around an extra half of an hour, just to make connections with each other. My role is simply to convene the meeting. Occasionally there is a speaker. The group has grown from nine to fifty by word of mouth alone."

    - In one small town, the school/family coordinator conducted a series of focus groups. The coordinator reports that this day-long session served many purposes, including solidifying attendees' understanding of the value of IEHS endeavors. For example, focus groups were conducted with senior citizens. When the coordinator invited them, she did not get a good response. But, when invitations were issued by the senior center facilitator (who also baked cinnamon rolls for the event), attendance was high. Although seniors were initially resistant to the idea of agencies "meddling in family business," they began to discuss problems their own grandchildren and step-grandchildren were having. They came up with many suggestions such as establishing "warm lines," mentoring programs, and family advocate services.

      After the community focus groups were completed, the IEHS coordinator compiled all of their responses and mailed a written summary to participants. Then, the IEHS collaborative team convened a day-long session for human service providers. Attendees included classroom teachers, school administrators, health care providers (including hospital staff), and social service providers. These providers were given all of the focus group information (suggestions which appeared more than five times were highlighted). They then met in small groups

where they were given a "fragile family" scenario. Each group had to identify which services were currently available for the "fragile family" members and where there were gaps in service. When the group gathered as a whole, they voted on the six most important services needed. Later, when state dollars became available, the community was able to fund the identified services.

- Local collaborators in one state worked to get business people on collaboration teams. The state facilitator who encouraged this connection said, "We asked them for their expertise and assistance before (or in place of) coming with hat in hand for funding."

2. **Conferences/Presentations/Trainings.** Conferences, presentations, and training sessions have been used to provide information on the IEHS concept.

   - Interviewees have used grant funds to take stakeholders to conferences, and conversely, to bring conferences to stakeholders. A coordinator said, "One principal had been very reluctant to join in and had already turned down a chance to have a family resource center (IEHS model) at her school. I used my grant money and took her to the *Families and Schools Conference* last year in Oakland. Now, she is sold on the idea and is working on setting up one at her school. In return for attending the conference, I asked her to speak at a principals' meeting. Our new superintendent is not as familiar with this concept. I tried to take her to Oakland and offered to take her to the *Child, Family and Community Conference* (12/13/94) in Portland. Educators need to hear from professionals in their own field."

   - Local demonstration sites requested and received $300 "mini-grants" to sponsor employer breakfasts. The breakfasts featured the governor as the guest speaker on IEHS. The goals of these breakfasts were to inform people in the business community about the problems facing many children and families in their community; allow them to learn from a top-level policymaker how IEHS policies can strengthen families; and to engage them in a discussion on how they can participate in this endeavor.

   - "We do a dog and pony show by bringing our providers into school staff meetings. They tell what they do and we emphasize that teachers don't have to call each provider directly, they can use their building referral team to access services."

   - "We take teachers and parents who have had success with the Family Resource Center and have them talk about it. We hope to bring teacher/parent teams to talk to site councils, school by school."

3. **Communication Networks.** IEHS program planners use a variety of media to inform and engage parents and other community stakeholders, including newsletters, brochures in multiple languages, and electronic mail.

- "Parents need to know what is going on in school, but they may not speak English or understand the school system. They need to be reached in their own language. We wrote our basic brochure in five languages to reach non-English speaking families."

- Program funds have been used to provide staff and parent training in designing and disseminating newsletters. At one site, facilitators were trained in newsletter writing skills. These newsletters go to teachers, school staff, social service agencies, and the PTA, who are all part of the collaboration.

- Another approach has been to provide parent training in the use of e-mail and electronic bulletin boards in order to foster communication and collaboration. One model is linking integration sites to each other with e-mail and training parents to become part of the "conferencing community." That means that parents are trained in the use of electronic bulletin boards so they can conference with parents at other sites about issues of common interest, like neighborhood safety. Parents can connect from home or use school-site computers.

4. **Stories.** The use of stories is closely related to presentations. Several sites mentioned that they use personal family stories to explain the need for IEHS policies and how the integrations work. This has included the use of written "storybooks," as well as presentations at meetings.

   - "We are doing an RTL (Readiness to Learn model) storybook. Each RTL site facilitator is collecting three success stories which tell how families received comprehensive services, and one story about how a systems barrier prevented them from comprehensively serving a family. The audience for this is our regional consortium, our steering committee, state education agency, legislators, parents, and the general public."

   - "We try to share stories at various meetings and encourage families to come tell their story at the United Way board meeting."

5. **Research Dissemination.** The dissemination of research findings is often used to describe the nature of the problem. As evaluations and program outcomes become available, those findings should also be useful in showing program effectiveness.

   - Some programs reported that they just needed to reproduce existing data in a new format so it is meaningful to their constituents.

   - "Some school staff members are very fearful (of implementing an IEHS model) even though they see how needy kids in their classes are. We need to involve them integrally from the beginning of the process, from the time they refer a child. Throughout the process, we need to ask for their feedback and give them feedback. We need to take data and reproduce it in a way that they can see the outcomes for their students."

- One interviewee noted that it takes a constant effort to share demographic data, including the nature of a problem and stories about students, with everyone in the community. People who are not parents -- seniors, apartment managers -- can still be drawn into the schools through a variety of community activities.

6. **Marketing Plans.** One interviewee said: "There has to be a continual marketing piece and a continuous forum for ongoing discussion." Some interviewees reported that they were working on the idea of community or statewide marketing plans to promote IEHS principles and models. One state is already in the process of designing a statewide marketing plan which is described below.

    - IEHS facilitators in the state's five regions are working with the Department of Family Services to design a communication campaign. The facilitators designed a campaign with strategies targeting three audiences, consumers of services; service providers; and the general public. The planners agreed that the state and region would work together to design a logo, brochures, posters, and refrigerator magnets. They would also design a media plan that may include securing radio and television endorsements and producing a video for public television. They planned to implement these tools in a manner appropriate to their communities.

7. **First-Hand Experience.** IEHS coordinators reported that facilitating volunteer experiences is often an effective strategy for reaching community members who may not be familiar with the challenges many families face. Through volunteer activity, community members often become more familiar with the challenges families face or the limited resources in schools and public agencies.

    - Interviewees reported that volunteer experiences like tutoring and mentoring in schools could promote an understanding of the issues many children and families face. Some mentioned opportunities for businesses such as job shadowing and school/business partnerships. One interviewee said, "It would be impossible for a business person to tutor and not have his/her eyes opened . . . and not come to understand why these services are needed."

    - "We are going to approach businesses and ask them to provide release time for parents to be involved in their children's schools."

    - One interviewee recalled participating in a group exercise as part of a community leadership development program. Participants role played trying to access multiple services. While not a "first-hand" experience, he reported new insights about the deficits of the currently fragmented service-delivery system.

    - "People are too far removed from the system, but volunteering can breed commitment. We need a fundamental understanding of what it means to be part of a community."

COMMUNICATING IDEAS TO STATE-LEVEL POLICYMAKERS

Community-Based Examples

In addition to using idea tools to communicate with fellow community members and service providers, these strategies can be used by local-level practitioners and policymakers to reach state-level officials. While the state is often responsible for providing policy direction, local-level leaders can also play a significant role in informing and guiding state policymakers. In some cases, local practitioners are the first to identify problems and the need for new policies and practices. The following two examples of how local leaders informed state officials of the need for IEHS principles and practices were provided by interviewees.

A community coordinator reported that, in her community, a grade school counselor became concerned about the number of children entering first grade with multiple problems who were "headed for trouble." The counselor asked the school superintendent for permission to convene a group of providers. He included the State Department of Family Services (DFS) in the collaboration because it serves children below school age. Other members included representatives from schools (including the counselor and speech teacher), public health departments, and mental health agencies. The community coordinator worked with this group and secured foundation funding for their collaborative endeavors. In time, the collaboration model served as a local-level idea tool which informed state policymakers. Once the state officials became familiar with this community endeavor and saw how IEHS principles worked in practice, they provided funding as well. Another example was provided by a school/community liaison. In that case, information and ideas came together from several directions, including the local-level.

> *Service providers and school administrators started to come together for two reasons, some because of grants (inducements), others because they just saw the need for these types of linkages. In the past, we didn't think about developing linkages outside our own agencies. But many of us who were in the social service field and also had children in schools began to see the need for comprehensive and collaborative services. As people began meeting and participating in linked services, relationships started to develop. We began reading the literature about service integration written in professional publications. Eventually, we approached the school superintendent with the idea of starting a school-based resource center. He was open to it -- in part because he served on the NWREL board and had been exposed to integration ideas through that connection. He was hearing from educator colleagues about the work on collaboration being done. He was also hearing the concerns of teachers who were dealing with students' social problems. Once we were all thinking about the problem in the same way, it was not a big leap to consider strategies. As a result, we began to write grants to fund collaborative efforts. At first, the state did not fund us, but we received a large grant from HHS.*

This school/community liaison reported that, while attending a NWREL conference on IEHS in 1992, she connected with the director of a social service advocacy group from her own state. This person was promoting family support (IEHS) principles to state agency department heads and other policymakers in her state. Their missions dovetailed. Because of the social service advocacy endeavors, the state decided to invest $1 million in local communities which were using family support principles to address child abuse and neglect At the same time, the school liaison's grassroots endeavors also informed state officials, including the state school superintendent, who came for site visits. As a result, she was invited to speak at meetings and conferences. In speaking of how local endeavors informed state policy, the liaison said, "the fact that the community and school district made this happen made the state take notice."

What Locals Want State Policymakers to Hear

Interviewees were asked what ideas and information they felt state level officials needed to hear from them. Representative responses are as follows:

- "When I go to the state legislators, I am struck by the spotty information they have They visited one program in their district and are all hot on that program. What I want to keep saying to the state is, 'Don't focus on just a part. You are responsible for the whole system. Yours is the one place responsible for the whole system.'"

- "State policymakers want schools to be more efficient. They are ready to blame young people, parents of children in trouble, and schools. They need to understand that integrated services are addressing root causes and that the process takes time. Change can take many years. It may take years just for parents to understand that they are valued and respected at their children's schools."

- "We need to let them know that it (the human service system) is not working now. In communities, even when the local level 'gets it,' the funding systems work against them. Then, people get discouraged with what appears to be a lack of coordination. The system is set up to be divisive, competitive, and fragmented. The distribution of funds needs to foster collaboration. Each new policy must be analyzed in terms of whether it is meeting IEHS principles. We need state policies to force us to incorporate the principles into practice, they should not be an add-on. We need mandates, but they shouldn't be too prescriptive because locals need to make their own decisions. Leadership needs to mandate the right thing to do from the top."

Strategies to Inform State-Level Policymakers

Finally, interviewees were asked what strategies they have used to inform and influence state-level policymakers. Several said they try to keep state officials informed through mailings and to encourage site visits. Other comments follow

- "Having young people testify. We always bring our program participants to the legislature. They write position papers and testify before committees. They tell their own stories. I also make sure that our local legislators all have a packet of information which describes what we are doing in schools."

- "We want our families to testify and show how our Home Visitor system makes a difference. We invite our legislators to meetings and send them information."

- "We are already doing a good job of reaching the state policy level. But with term limits, there will be no time to reach legislators after they arrive. So, we need to get to know them and lobby them during the campaigns. We need to be on a first name basis with their staffs."

SECTION FOUR: CONCLUSIONS

This paper reaches five conclusions about the use of idea tools in promoting service integration policy and practice:

1. **Idea Tools May Be A Key Factor In Translating IEHS Policies Into Systemic Reform.** School-linked service integration policies require a systemic change which is predicated upon stakeholders' knowledge-base, values, and preferences. First, stakeholders must become informed about the existing issues: many children are not receiving sufficient educational, health, and social supports; and education and other human service delivery systems do not currently provide comprehensive and collaborative services which strengthen and support families. Knowledge of these issues can encourage or reinforce beliefs that stakeholders have a common interest in enabling families and communities to strengthen each other. Second, stakeholders need opportunities to learn how IEHS practices strengthen families. Third, they need the opportunity to discuss which IEHS models are appropriate for their individual communities. Idea tools are a means for policymakers to address all of these issues. They can be used to expand stakeholders' knowledge-base of problems and solutions, and to encourage preferences for IEHS policy outcomes.

2. **Ideas Travel Laterally And Up, As Well As Down.** Although Weiss (1990) views idea tools as top-down instruments, they clearly can be used by local-level practitioners and policymakers to inform and foster discourse among service providers and other community members. One interviewee described sharing a collaborative vision with other providers, particularly those concerned with protecting their turf, as "inviting people in -- making the circle wider and wider until everyone is inside." Local level practitioners provided many examples of how they successfully provided information and encouraged peers to understand and value IEHS principles. In addition to the lateral transfer of ideas, idea tools can also be used to effect "bottom-up" changes. Local practitioners identified idea tool strategies -- from written communications, to modeling IEHS practices -- which informed state-level policymakers and effected state-level changes. As federal and state governments cede financing and decisionmaking responsibilities to local communities, local-level policymakers will have new opportunities to design and implement collaborations. Idea tools can become a powerful component of their own policy tool kits.

3. **Northwest Communities Are Clearly Utilizing A Wide Variety Of Idea Tools In Promoting IEHS Principles And Values.** Because IEHS models are community-based, each local collaboration determines which strategies are appropriate and effective for them. Idea strategies are currently being used by Northwest policymakers to encourage community and professional development by providing information on the nature of a problem; describing the benefits of IEHS polices; and fostering public and professional discourse on preferred outcomes. A variety of strategies are used, such as convening stakeholders; sponsoring conferences and trainings; establishing communication networks; sharing family stories; disseminating research; designing marketing plans; and facilitating

the first-hand experiences of community members with "fragile families" and human service delivery systems.

4. **Idea Tools May Work Best In Conjunction With Other Policy Tools.** In the case of school-linked service integration, idea tools are frequently coupled with inducement policy tools, such as providing funds for demonstration projects to establish IEHS models and expert technical assistance. Other policy tools, such as mandates requiring inter-agency collaboration as a condition of receiving funding, are also used in combination with idea instruments.

5. **Although Many Idea Strategies Are In Use, Further Work Is Needed To Assess Their Effectiveness.** Evaluation studies are needed to assess whether some strategies work better than others and which factors determine success. These studies may need to rely on the development of sophisticated mapping techniques to diagram the transfer of ideas, and qualitative information, such as case studies. One consideration in evaluation design is that idea tools take effect over a long period of time. Weiss (1990) points out that, "Inducements work on a relatively short-time horizon, while ideas work on a relatively long-time horizon " (p. 196). Evaluation will also be complicated by the fact that IEHS idea tools are used in combination with other policy tools, making it difficult to sort out causal factors.

NEXT STEPS

Findings from this preliminary exploration uncovered many potential areas for further investigation. The Child, Family, and Community Program will confer with Northwest policymakers and practitioners to add to the list below, as well as to determine which topics seem most promising and useful to further exploration.

1. **Working With Northwest Communities To Discuss The Implications Of These Findings.** Most interviewees were in the early stages of thinking about how to use idea tools to develop the shared principles and goal setting critical to IEHS implementation. They expressed the need to share ideas and information with service providers and other community members. One of our reviewers wrote, "I find reading about the experiences of others very helpful. It takes all the research and makes it "real" for me. As a practitioner in the field (especially in the 'rural' field), papers like this give me the same 'fix' I get when I attend a conference and hear the various discussions by speakers and panelists about a subject. Although I can't interact like I can at a conference, the paper allows me to formulate ideas and actions that I can then discuss with my colleagues . . . So for me, dissemination of a paper like this is the key -- to policy/decisionmakers, as well as principals, administrators, and human service professionals." A valuable next step would be to share these preliminary findings with community leaders so they can learn from each other.

2. **Expand The Parameters Of The Study**. Further exploration and documentation of how idea tools are used to assess needs and implement IEHS is called for. The current study interviewed a limited number of people and interview questions were exploratory. Further research would draw on a broader audience and look more closely at effectiveness, successes, and failures. The findings from this study establish a framework for further exploration. These findings will be useful in designing interview and focus group questions to uncover how collaborations address each of the policy challenges identified, describing the nature of a problem, providing examples of models, and developing a shared vision.

   In addition to documenting strategies, a further investigation could incorporate assessment. It could look at which strategies are most useful for promoting community development and professional development. Within those two categories, a finer cut could also look at whether specific strategies are most effective for target audiences. In terms of community development, for instance, the study could explore which strategies are most successful with business groups, parents, or service organizations. In terms of professional development, it could also look at whether certain strategies are more effective with providers from different agencies and disciplines.

3. **Explore The State Role In Disseminating Ideas**. This paper focuses on local community strategies. However, the idea tool concept is most commonly used as a top-down approach. Clearly, state-level leaders use idea strategies to promote IEHS principles and practices. A future paper could explore the use of these tools by state level policymakers in the NWREL region.

4. **Explore Effective IEHS Policy Implementation Strategies**. As noted in Section Two, idea tools are often used in conjunction with other strategies. In the Northwest, this has included inducement policy tools such as the provision of demonstration grants and technical assistance, and mandates requiring the establishment of local community collaborations. Further research could examine which policy tool combinations seem to be most effective in the implementation of IEHS principles and practices. This type of analysis could guide policymakers, at all levels, concerned with IEHS implementation.

5. **Dig Deeper Into The Role Of Policy In Promoting A "Shared Vision."** Much of the literature on IEHS is based on the expectation that communities must come to agree on a shared vision for the future of children and families, as well as a shared vision for how to support and strengthen families. However, many policies relating to family issues -- welfare reform, policies affecting pregnant teenagers, and universal health care -- are among the most controversial issues in America today. Reaching a consensus on the role of communities in supporting its families will be a formidable task. Providing information and promoting discourse is an important step toward reaching that consensus. As one of our reviewers wrote us, "The enormity of the shift in perspective it will take for us to work effectively in school-linked human services is difficult to fathom and explain. This is the issue that all of us in schools are trying to tackle in school reform. The problem is that we cannot achieve school reform without reform in surrounding communities. Once we understand this from our very core, then we behave very differently. We see the world through a very different filter."

REFERENCES

Adler, L. and Gardner, S. (Ed). (1993). *The Politics Of Linking Schools And Social Services*. Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Behrman, R.E. (Ed.). (1992). *The Future Of Children -- School-Linked Services 2*, (1). Center for the Future of Children: David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Bruner, C. (1991). Thinking Collaboratively: Ten Questions And Answers To Help Policymakers Improve Children's Services. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Chaskin, R. and Richman, H. (1992). Concerns About School-Linked Services: Institution-Based Versus Community-Based Models. In R.E. Behrman (Ed.), *The Future Of Children -- School-Linked Services* (pp 107-117). Center for the Future of Children: David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Dougherty, V. State Policy-Makers Play Key Role In Interagency Collaboration. (Spring-Summer 1994). *State Education Leader 13* (1). Education Commission of the States.

Gardner, S. (1992). Key Issues In Developing School-Linked Integrated Services. In R.E. Behrman (Ed.), *The Future Of Children -- School-Linked Services* (pp 85-94). Center for the Future of Children: David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Gerry, M. and Certo, N. (1992). Current Activity At The Federal Level And The Need For Service Integration. In R.E. Behrman (Ed.), *The Future Of Children -- School-Linked Services* (pp 118-126). Center for the Future of Children: David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Gomby, D. and Larson, C. (1992). Evaluation Of School-Linked Services. In R.E. Behrman (Ed.), *The Future Of Children -- School-Linked Services* (pp 68-84). Center for the Future of Children: David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1989). The Same Client: The Demographics Of Education And Service Delivery Systems. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hood, C. (1983). *The Tools Of Government*. London and Basingstoke: MacMillan.

Jehl, J. and Kirst, M. (1992). Getting Ready To Provide School-Linked Services: What Schools Must Do. In R.E. Behrman (Ed.), *The Future Of Children -- School-Linked Services* (pp 95-106). Center for the Future of Children: David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Jewett, J., Conklin, N. Hagans, R. and Crohn, L. (1991). *Conceptual Synthesis And Review Of Community-Based Integration Activity.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Knapp, M. (1994). How Shall We Study Comprehensive, Collaborative Services For Children And Families? Unpublished manuscript. University of Washington, Seattle.

Koppich, J. and Kirst, M. (Eds.) (1993). Integrating Services For Children: Prospects And Pitfalls. *Education And Urban Society , 25* (2).

Levy, J. and Shepardson, W. (1992). A Look At Current School-Linked Service Efforts. In R.E. Behrman (Ed.), *The Future Of Children -- School-Linked Services* (pp 44-55). Center for the Future of Children: David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

McDonnell, L., and Elmore, R. (1987). *Alternative Policy Instruments.* Santa Monica, CA. Center for Policy Research in Education Joint Note JNE-03.

Melaville, A.I., Blank, M.J., and Asayesh, G. (1992). *Together We Can: A Guide To Crafting Community-Based Family-Centered Strategies For Integrating Education And Human Services.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Morrill, W. (1992). Overview Of Service Delivery To Children. In R.E. Behrman (Ed.), *The Future Of Children -- School-Linked Services* (pp 32-43). Center for the Future of Children: David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Mosborg, S., Nissani, H., and Hagans, R. *Integrating Education And Human Services: Lessons From Early Initiatives In The Northwest.* (in press, 1994). Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Nissani H. and Hagans R. (1992). *The Power Of Integrating Education And Human Services: Achieving The Potential Of The Northwest.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Nissani, H. and Horine, L. (1994). *Northwest Policy: Bridges And Barriers To The Integration Of Education And Human Services.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Riley, R. (November, 1994). Families Come First. *Principal, 74* (2), 30-32.

Saloman, L., and Lund, M. (1989). The Tools Approach: Basic Analytics. In Lester Salomon (Ed.) *Beyond Privatization: The Tools Of Government Action.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Schneider A, and Ingram H. (1990). Behavioral Assumptions Of Policy Tools. *Journal Of Politics, 52* (2), 511-528.

Slaughter, L. School Reform Survey. Seattle, WA: Washington Mutual Bank.

Weiss, J.A. (1990). Ideas And Inducements In Mental Health Policy. *Journal Of Policy Analysis And Management, 9* (2), 179-200.

White House (1994). *Comprehensive Strategies For Children And Families: The Role Of Schools And Community-Based Organizations*. Report of the July 1994 White House Meeting. Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX 1

Interviewees

Theresa Bommersbach, Project Coordinator, Readiness To Learn Program, Yakima Valley Farmworkers Clinic, Toppenish, Washington.

Rick Brandon, Executive Director, Human Services Policy Center, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Sarah France, Director, Washington Alliance for Restructuring Education, Seattle, Washington.

Mary Frost, Unit Manager, Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program, Dept. of Trade and Community Development, Olympia, Washington.

'lyn Horine, Mid-Willamette Community Action Agency, Salem, Oregon.

Mike Knapp, Project Evaluator, TIC program, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Sue Lerner, Director, Educational Support and Human Services, South Central School District, Tukwila, Washington.

Susan Mosborg, Education Consultant, Seattle, Washington.

Steve Mullin, Executive Director, Partnership for Learning, Seattle, Washington.

Steve Nelson, Director, Rural Ed Program, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon.

Ann Reed, Community Coordinator, Families in Partnership, Libby, Montana.

Barbara Riley, School Liaison, Family Housing Intervention Network, Women's Opportunity and Resource Development, Missoula, Montana.

Ken Settlemeier, Director of K–12 Education, Lincoln County School District, Newport, Oregon.

Billie Warford, Director, Early Childhood Project, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.

Focus Group Participants

Pinna Hinds-Arnold, President of Roth Hinds Arnold, Inc., Salem, Oregon.

Bob Chudek, David Douglas School District.

Kathy Garland, Director, Marion County Children and Families Commission, Salem, Oregon.

Judy Jindra, Coordinator, Readiness to Learn Project, Federal Way, Washington.

Melinda Leonard, City of Seattle.

Mickey Noland, Whidby Island.

Billie Warford, Director, Montana State University Early Childhood Project.

APPENDIX 2

Interview Questions

In discussions, policymakers and other professionals mentioned the importance of helping service providers and community members understand the rationale for comprehensive, collaborative, and family supportive services. These professionals are interested in policies and strategies which promote the concept and principles of service integration. I'd like to ask you a few questions about implementing school-linked service integration policies.

1. What do you perceive as the role of values and ideas in promoting school-linked service integration?

2. In thinking of the local community arena, what do you think are the most significant principles relating to the integration of education and human services? What is the most important message to get across?

3. Which categories of community members do you think need to be reached?

4. Which strategies do you feel would be effective in promoting this message to the community members you identified?

   a) school people;

   b) other service providers,

   c) community at large;

   d) business leaders.

5. Now, in thinking about messages that state policymakers need to hear, what message do communities need to give to state policymakers?

6. What strategies would be effective for reaching them?

7. What is your vision of IEHS -- for your constituents or community -- five years from now?

APPENDIX 3

EXAMPLES OF IEHS MODELS

The following examples of IEHS models are not meant to be comprehensive; rather, they provide an idea of the variety and scope of the integrations.

Please note that most of this information is taken word-for-word from publications provided by the project. Brief interviews were also conducted.

1. PROJECT L.O.O.K., AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAM, HIGHLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON.

Goals. Project L.O.O.K. is grounded in the belief that families need more control over their lives, and agencies must collaborate in order to reduce redundancy, offer opportunities, and increase services to the families where they live. The after-school programs are successful in these ways: decreasing violence in neighborhoods, increasing academic achievement, enhancing home/school communication, connecting families to health services, and assisting families with job placement.

WHO IS SERVED?

Program Description. Services are provided to children enrolled in three elementary schools. Three apartments are involved, each linked with one school. Three after-school programs are located at the SeaHurst Manor Apartments and Juanita Apartments in Burien, and the Brentwood Place Apartments in SeaTac. The following services are available to families: academic tutoring, computer training, alcohol and other drug counseling, home visits by a public health nurse, crime prevention, social worker advocate, general equivalency diploma (GED) classes, employment counseling, crisis intervention, community resource networking, translation services, ESL classes, and parenting classes.

Initially conceived by teachers, staff, and family members at one school, it is the result of three years of discussion among parents, community members, and school staff. Two apartment complexes were identified as housing a large proportion of low income/low achieving students. After school each day, students go to the apartment school for three hours. The apartments are staffed by a teacher and teacher assistant. They help the children with their homework, work on computer programs, read, cook, and do other types of educational activities. The apartment is also staffed with a drug and alcohol counselor who does drug and alcohol prevention with the students, a public health nurse who does individual home visits with each family and health education with the children, a community service officer who does crime prevention with the students and parents, a school social worker who works with the children on problem solving and as an advocate

for the families in the school, and a family social worker who works with each family on helping them achieve their goals, such as GED, employment, counseling, etc., as well as crisis intervention and community resources for the family.

The program provides translation services, GED classes, ESL classes, parenting classes, and opportunities for service providers to interact on a more personal level with participants. This project has shown to be extremely successful for many families in the short time that it has been in operation, and there is now a waiting list for people to get into the program.

Collaboration Partners. The State of Washington, the Highline School District, Department of Social and Health Services, the Seattle/King County Department of Public Health, the Ruth Dykeman Center, and the King County Police Department.

Funders. Readiness To Learn funds, Family Policy Initiative, State of Washington.

2. PARKWOOD FAMILIES IN ACTION, SHORELINE, WASHINGTON (READINESS TO LEARN PROJECT).

Goals. The Families in Action program provides opportunities for the success of all students by creating support systems and empowering families to use community resources; developing partnerships between families, schools, and communities, thereby building trust and encouraging involvement in our children's growth; and recognizing and respecting the diversity of all families.

Who Is Served. The Parkwood School community -- those families with children enrolled in Parkwood School are the primary constituents. In some cases, other community members may enroll in programs. For example, ESL classes are offered in partnership with Shoreline Community College, and are therefore open to that school's constituents, as well.

Program Description. FIA is governed by a Program Council composed of parents, community members, teachers, and human service professionals. Examples of activities sponsored by the Parkwood FIA include:

- Activities for the parent community: parenting classes, parent support groups, and "last-Friday-of-the-month family dinners." FIA is collaborating with Lutheran Family Services to offer counseling and support groups for parents and children experiencing divorce.

- Activities targeted to ESL families: Parent ESL classes offered jointly with two other Shoreline schools. The curriculum focuses on learning about health and parenting issues and the American school system. Discussions are held on topics such as parent/teacher conferences, coping with children's illnesses, and volunteering in school. FIA also sponsors cultural evenings for ESL parents (with separate nights for Chinese, Hispanic, Vietnamese, and Filipino parents).

- Children's programs: after-school programs on early dismissal days and enrichment classes like computer skills for parents and creative writing for children.

- A school newsletter describing school and public programs.

- Home Visit Program. Students are referred to the Families in Action (FIA) coordinator from school, including the school principal, teachers, school psychologists, nurses, or community members like other families or human service professionals. The school nurse contacts the family and sets up an appointment with the FIA Home Visitor. The Home Visitor consults with school personnel and brings a variety of information and forms for social services (such as energy assistance), helps make appointments at clothing and food banks, and public health clinics; and assesses the need for referral to other agencies (such as parenting classes or mental health counseling). The Home Visitor then provides the FIA coordinator with information and supervises coordination of services.

Collaboration Partners. Mental Health North; DSHS; Shoreline Community College; King County Parks and Recreation; King County Public Health Department; Lutheran Social Services Agency; Refugee Women's Alliance; Safeway; Shoreline PTA; Shoreline High School; and Einstein Middle School.

Funders. Readiness to Learn Grant, Family Policy Initiative, State of Washington. The program has also received some funds from the PTA and from a local private school so their children can participate in the enrichment programs.

3. GLENDALE/AZALEA SKILLS CENTER, GLENDALE, OREGON.

Goals. The goal of the Center is to promote healthy children, healthy families, and a healthy community; to provide students in the Glendale School District with a 'Running Start' toward meaningful employment and/or further education; to provide support services to students and families which will address barriers to positive school learning experiences; to provide a variety of community and social services at a single location; and to address the needs of unemployed and under-employed youth and adult citizens in the community.

Who Is Served. The center provides health education and social services to infants, children, teens, adults and seniors.

Program Description. The Skills Center is a school-linked, community-based service integration project serving the rural communities of Glendale and Azalea, Oregon. The Glendale/Azalea Skills Center provides on-site health, education, and social services. The Center's mission goes beyond providing services to limited populations such as teen parents or children. The Center's providers and participants believe that to truly support the well-being of children and families, the community must also be healthy and viable.

The Center, therefore, provides a broad range of activities which support such goals as economic development, community pride, and respect for diversity. A walk through the Center gives a visible picture of its holistic philosophy. The Welfare office is open to families just 20 feet from an Historical Society presentation. A GED class is conducted down the hall from a BLM land-use meeting. A family receives counseling next door to an employment workshop. At night, 12-step support groups share the building with displaced timber workers taking classes and the Economic Development Council. Each day, toddlers and seniors, wealthy and poor, students and employers, cross paths at the Center. The facility includes offices for programs and services, three classrooms, a technology center, and a day care center. The Center offers alternative education to youth who need these services (including pregnant and parenting teens), high school completion and GED for youth and adults, job training and retraining for entry level and displaced workers, and all the related services."

Collaboration Partners. Douglas County Health Department, Adult and Family Services Division, Umpqua Community College, Employment Department (Douglas and Josephine Counties), Vocational Rehabilitation Division, Douglas County Mental Health, Umpqua Training & Employment, Douglas County ESD, Douglas County Sheriff, AA, Al-Anon and Al-A-Teen, community members and businesses, FISH, Children's Services Division, Senior and Disabled Services, Youth Services, parents, Glendale School District #77, Superior Lumber Company. The Center has broad-based community support and is housed in a building donated by the local lumber company."

Funders. Ford Family Foundation; U.S. and Oregon Department of Education; Commission On Children and Families; Superior Lumber Company. Partners: Adult and Family Services, Children Services Division; Disability Services Office; Douglas County Health Department; Education Service District; Oregon Department of Human Resources; Oregon Employment Department; Umpqua Community College; Umpqua Training and Employment; Wooley Center. Supporting agencies: Battered Persons Advocacy; FISH, Job Corp ; Legal Aid; St. Vincent DePaul; UCAN.

4. ROOSEVELT FAMILY RESOURCE CENTER, MISSOULA, MONTANA.

Goals. The overall goal of the Roosevelt Family Resource Center is to provide support, resources, and information to parents through both structured and unstructured programs. The Year 1 objectives were based on two stated goals: increasing parent involvement in the school, and providing information and access to community resources.

Outcome objectives:

1. Increase parent involvement at Roosevelt school by 20 percent;

2. Increase parent/school communication to twice monthly per family, and

3. Increase knowledge of community human services programs by parents, as evidenced by attendance at programs offered by community agencies and resource and referral information given out at the center."

Who Is Served. The Roosevelt School community, made up of more than 190 families, including 500+ parents and children with 85 single parent families (44 percent of the target population) and 76 families with an income low enough to qualify for free and reduced lunches. In addition, Roosevelt serves children who are living in the Domestic Violence Assistance Center, and up to ten children each year who are living in Russian speaking homes. The 1993-94 school year included eight children whose families had a least one episode of homelessness. In the first six months of the 1994-95 school year, the center was used by 92 families.

We have not 'targeted' any specific segment of our school population; rather, all families are welcomed and eligible for programs and services."

Program Description. The Family Resource Center at Roosevelt School and its parent-based staff of Parent Outreach Specialists is a unique and neighborhood-based effort to provide a support system and access to the resources of the larger community.

Information and referral services provide families with personal consultations, transportation help, and direct access to case management services when needed. The center is linked to more than 35 community agencies through its collaborative ties and offers a place for parents and agency representatives to meet and discuss common concerns.

The Parent Outreach Workers are the primary facilitators of these core services and are crucial to the operation of the center.

The program is designed to reflect the local community of families with children that attend Roosevelt school as well as the staff that work there. Innovative aspects of the program include the use of students' parents as staff, senior citizen volunteers, and university students who live in the neighborhood, and outreach to families with young children not yet enrolled in school.

Focus groups with Roosevelt parents, as well as the on-going guidance of an advisory board of teachers, school administrators, social service professionals, and parents have and will continue to shape the content and tone of services. Together, this school community organizes, implements, and evaluates the programs offered by the center. For example, parents asked for 'craft' classes last winter. Craft classes led to discussion about health concerns. A public health nurse started to schedule monthly visits to the center to answer parents' questions. As a result, parents gained access to both the informal and formal support systems available throughout city-county health department."

Collaboration Partners: Several agencies have played a major part in the provision of services by the center. They include: Child Care Resources, Missoula City-County Health Department, and the Family Housing Intervention Network.

Funders. The initial start-up funds came from three sources: WORD's Family Housing Intervention Network school-based Integration of Education and Human Service project; Missoula's School District #1; Early Childhood Interagency Collaboration project, funded through a statewide project of the Kellogg Foundation; Technical Assistance support from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon. Funders now include Montana Children's Trust Fund.

5. FAMILIES IN PARTNERSHIP PROJECT, LIBBY, MONTANA

Goals. The program goals are to develop a comprehensive continuum of services in partnership with community organizations that will increase the capabilities of at-risk families to nurture their children in healthy environments by providing parents with the knowledge, skills, and support they need to do so; decrease the incidence of child abuse and neglect in the targeted population; and improve the availability of service agencies to deliver coordinated, family-focused services that are preventive, non-punitive, voluntary, and culturally responsive."

Who Is Served. The state mandates allow the program to serve two categories of consumers: (1) families with children ages 0–3 (the children must present multiple risk factors), and (2) families referred by the Department of Family Services in cases where there is no imminent danger to the children.

Program Description. Lincoln County was chosen as one of five pilot communities in Montana to reduce child abuse and neglect by providing in-home services to families who are at risk of abusing or neglecting their children. The Home Visitors are para-professionals who are specially trained to meet with families who have been identified as being a risk of abusing or neglecting their children but the child is not in imminent danger of being placed by Family Services. These Home Visitors ascertain what services the family needs to build on the strengths it already has. The necessary services might be parent education, child behavior management techniques, or referrals to other community services including WIC, mental health, Women's Help Line, medical providers, Department of Family Services, respite child care, etc., with the goal of intervening and preventing child abuse and neglect and strengthening the family so the children may stay with their families and not be placed in Foster Homes. Referral families for this program come from DFS, the medical community, and the community at large. Coupled with the Partnership grant is an Emergency Respite Child Care grant to provide up to 30 days emergency child care for a family who meets the grant's criteria.

'Getting Things Done' is a grant provided to Libby to identify community service needs that could be filled by volunteers and recruit volunteers to fill those needs. A small amount of funding came with the grant to pay for material for projects, and we ask the communities' help in identifying those needs and volunteering to fill them.

'ParentShare' is a parent education and support group for mothers of children ages 1 to 6. Informally this has always gone on with mothers with children of approximately the same

age who gathered together to share hard-earned lessons in child rearing with one another. This grant provides a parenting newsletter and a coordinator to contact mothers, set up meeting places, solicit educators to come and give talks of interest to those mothers, pay for baby sitting while the mothers are there, and give these mothers an outlet to share with one another their successes and frustrations in a non-judgmental atmosphere.

Also, the FIP director conducts community assessments through strategies such as focus groups to determine where service gaps exist. She convenes community members and providers to address how to meet those gaps.

Collaboration Partners. Partners include the community at large including the Libby Community Interagency, Inc. (LCI). LCI collaboration partners include: Chamber of Commerce, Economic Development, Department of Family Services, Family Planning, Flathead Valley Community College, Lincoln County Campus, Nurturing Center, Libby Job Service, Lincoln County School District, private Counselors, youth organizations, community cultural organizations, Lincoln County Public Library, Lincoln County Women's Help Line, Literacy Volunteers of America, Mental Health Center, Kootenai Valley Head Start, Ministerial Association of Libby, MSU County Extension, Northwest Montana Human Resources, Recovery Northwest, Pregnancy Crisis Center, St. John's Lutheran Hospital, Women's, Infants, and Children (WIC), Welfare Department

Funders. State of Montana.